REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 12/31/08, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending.

In the Office Action mailed 12/31/08, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (U.S. Patent 6,055,619; "North") in view of Chou et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,897; "Chou") and Moyer et al. (U.S. Patent 6,449,675; "Moyer"); claims 9-11, 13, 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over North in view of Chou and Moyer; claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over North in view of Chou and Moyer and in combination with what is well known as evidenced by Feldbaumer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,586,046; "Feldbaumer") and Fletcher et al. (U.S. Patent 5,155,387; "Fletcher"); and claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over North in view of Chou, Moyer and Park (U.S. Patent 5,903,779).

The Examiner has now cited North in addition to the earlier cited references in maintaining the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections. Applicant submits that North discloses a processing subsystem which includes a stream processor for simultaneously processing multiple streams of audio data. Chou discloses a exemplary CPU-based system. The interrupt requests may be received from peripheral devices such as a keyboard, mouse, monitor, printer and disk drive as well as other elements of a computer system (Chou at col. 4, lines 45-47). Moyer describes a data processing system having CPU circuitry, memory circuitry, timer circuitry, serial circuitry, other circuitry and system integration circuitry (Moyer at col. 2, lines 1-4). Thus, any interrupt handling described with regard to these references correspond to the systems described.

Applicant submits that North, Chou and Moyer fail to disclose a packet manager that handles interrupts relating to packet data. The Examiner has noted in rejecting claims 2 and 3 that the additional limitation reciting a packet manager input circuit (or output circuit) recite differences that are found only in the labeling. In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 to recite that the packet manager routes data packets between the external devices and the processors (or processing cores

in claim 11). Furthermore, claims 1 and 9 recite that the virtual channels are for routing data packets and the selective routing of the interrupts is performed in the packet manager. Thus, Applicant submits that the packet manager is now functionally claimed and is not just a labeling. Applicant submits that North, Chou and Moyer fail to disclose these features of the claimed elements of a packet manager as now recited in the amended claims 1 and 9. The remaining claims, being dependent from either claim 1 or 9, also are distinguishable for the above reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims overcome the Examiner's rejections based on North, Chou and Moyer together, or North, Chou and Moyer in combination with Feldbaumer, Fletcher and/or Park.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and allow pending claims 1-4 and 6-17, as amended.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 03/31/2009   By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/
                                      William W. Kidd
                                      Reg. No. 31,772
                                      Phone: (512) 263-1842
                                        Fax No: (512) 263-1469
                                        Email:wkidd@texaspatents.com